

**Latimer, Becky**

**From:** Latimer, Becky  
**Sent:** Monday, March 18, 2019 2:59 PM  
**To:** [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** RE: [External] Please reject Duke Energy's mandatory fee hike

Dear Mr. Ben Hallissy,

This is to acknowledge receipt of your Letter of Protest/Comments to the Public Service Commission of South Carolina. Your Letter of Protest/Comments will be placed in the Protest File of the Docket listed below and on the Commission's Website at [www.psc.sc.gov](http://www.psc.sc.gov).

- Docket No. 2018-319-E - Application of Duke Energy Carolinas, LLC for Adjustments in Electric Rate Schedules and Tariffs and Request for an Accounting Order

A Protestant is an individual objecting on the ground of private or public interest to the approval of an Application, Petition, Motion or other matters which the Commission may have under consideration. A Protestant may offer sworn testimony but cannot cross-examine witnesses offered by other parties.

According to the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure, filing a Protest does not make you a Party of Record. A Protestant desiring to become an Intervenor (i.e., a Party of Record) in a proceeding before the Commission may file a Petition for Intervention within the time prescribed by the Commission.

You can follow this Docket and other daily filings made at the Commission by subscribing to the Commission's Email Subscriptions at this link: <https://dms.psc.sc.gov/Web/Email>; or you can follow the individual Docket at the link listed below:

Docket No. 2018-319-E - Application of Duke Energy Carolinas, LLC for Adjustments in Electric Rate Schedules and Tariffs and Request for an Accounting Order - <https://dms.psc.sc.gov/Web/Dockets/Detail/116872>

If we may be of further assistance to you, please do not hesitate to contact us.

Sincerely,

Becky Latimer  
 Clerks Office/Administrative Coordinator

Public Service Commission of South Carolina  
 803-896-5100

**Sign up for Meeting Agenda Alerts: Text PSCAGENDAS to 39492**

---

**From:** DeSanty, Tricia  
**Sent:** Monday, March 18, 2019 2:53 PM  
**To:** Easterling, Deborah <Deborah.Easterling@psc.sc.gov>  
**Cc:** Adams, Hope <Hope.Adams@psc.sc.gov>; Latimer, Becky <Becky.Latimer@psc.sc.gov>  
**Subject:** FW: [External] Please reject Duke Energy's mandatory fee hike

Tricia O. DeSanty  
 Administrative Coordinator  
 Public Service Commission of South Carolina

From: Ben Hallissy  
 Sent: Monday, March 18, 2019 2:22 PM  
 To: PSC\_Commissioner.Ervin  
 Subject: [External] Please reject Duke Energy's mandatory fee hike

Commissioner Ervin,

I've been a Duke Energy customer in Greenville since November of 2016 and **I object to their proposed 2019 rate increase** - it is unjustifiable, inequitable and bad for both consumers and the environment.

While I am fortunate that the proposed fixed-fee hike would not harm my well being or that of my family the same cannot be said of many in the upstate. The potential damaging impact to those with low energy consumption or on a fixed income has been apparent at the three recent hearings in the upstate so let me focus on two other points

1. The increase to the fixed fee will increase revenue, but it harms my freedom to determine my expenses and may cause Duke to overbuild generation capacity. If what Duke needs is revenue stability to protect against grid defection, I would suggest either using a minimum bill or decoupling revenue from electricity sales with an adjustable volumetric rate. Both could provide revenue stability AND incentives to conserve if the rates are set correctly. Increasing consumer options for time-of-use or real-time pricing would also help align the costs of Duke with the bills of consumers. For more details and references I'd recommend the white paper, "***A Troubling Trend in Rate Design***" [available online here](#).
2. The proposed fixed fee would be the highest in the nation, and yet even today it is not delineated clearly on customers bills. The current \$8.29/mo is nowhere to be found on the bill, and there are additional riders, such as for having natural gas furnace, that aren't even included in the published rate documents online. I had to talk to four different people at Duke before someone was able to tell me why my bill didn't match the published rates - it was because I had a natural gas furnace (go figure). **I hope you will argue for billing transparency as part of the rate agreement.**

I would be happy to answer any further questions and to be clear, **please reject the Duke's rate hike as proposed.**

Thanks for your time and for representing the upstate on the PSC.

Best regards,  
 Ben Hallissy

Greenville SC 29615